DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 270 FL 020 137

AUTHOR Obeidat, Hussein; Kapanga, Mwamba
TITLE The Behavior of Non-Terms in Shaba Swahili: A Relational Approach.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 15p.; In: Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics. Vol. 13; see FL 020 123.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Countries; *Grammar; *Sentence Structure; *Structural Analysis (Linguistics); *Swahili; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Relativization

ABSTRACT

The behavior of non-terms in Shaba Swahili is examined within the framework of relational grammar. Shaba Swahili is peculiar because it reflects a complex linguistic situation; its population consisted of people coming from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. The behavior of Shaba Swahili non-terms is discussed with reference to several syntactic processes, such as passivization, relativization, raising, and the interaction of these processes in simple as well as complex sentences. It is argued that non-terms behave exactly like terms. The following conclusions are drawn: (1) non-terms in Swahili can be relativized and passivized; (2) non-terms, like terms, can undergo direct passivation and relativization; i.e., they can be promoted directly to subject position; (3) non-terms can relativize between sentences in complex passive and relative clauses and still control agreement in the embedded clause; (4) passivization and relativization of non-terms move the whole locative/instrumental phrase; and (5) a resumptive pronoun is obligatorily restrained only in cases that involve relativization of instruments. Contains 22 references. (Author/LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Manuel-Dupont
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED342270

THE BEHAVIOR OF NON-TERMS IN SHABA SWAHILI

A RELATIONAL APPROACH

Hussein Obeidat and Mwamba Kapanga

Abstract: This paper is an attempt to examine the behavior of Non-Terms in Shaba Swahili within the framework of Relational Grammar. The behavior of Non-Terms will be discussed with reference to several syntactic processes such as Passivization, Relativization, Raising, and the interaction of these processes in simple as well as complex sentences. We will argue that (1) Non-Terms in Swahili can be relativized and passivized; (2) Non-Terms, like Terms, can undergo direct Passivization and Relativization. That is they can be promoted to subject position without undergoing locative'instrumental to 3 to 2 to 1 advancement; (3) Non-Terms can relativize intersentencially in complex passive and relative clauses and still control agreement in the embedded clause; (4) Passivization and Relativization of Non-Terms move the whole locative/ instrumental phrase; and (5) a resumptive pronoun is obligatorily retained only in cases that involve Relativization of instruments.

Introduction

The theory of RG articulated in Johnson 1974; Postal 1977; Postal and Perlmutter 1977; 1983; Frantz 1981, among others, assumes that syntactic rules such as Passivization, Relativization and Raising are limited only to Terms; i.e., subject of, direct object of and indirect object of. Non-Terms or obliques such as locatives, instrumentals, temporals, etc. cannot undergo any relation-changing rules. In case one of these Non-terms is promoted, the highest position it can be promoted to is direct object of, and the promotion process must be systematic. With respect to Raising, Postal (1974) proposed that raising should be universally restricted to complement subjects. Seiter (1978) has modified this univerasal to incorporate also the raising of objects of complements and considered this modification to be optional as a language particular phenomenon.

The main objective of this paper is to argúe that in Shaba Swahili Non-Terms behave exactly like Terms. Specifically, it will be demonstrated (1) that Non-Terms can undergo all kinds of relation-changing syntactic rules such as Passivization, Relativization and Raising in different types of structures; (2) that Non-Terms, like Terms, govern agreement on the verb, not only in matrix clauses to which they have been promoted but also in embedded clauses where they have been extracted from; (3) that Non-Terms can be promoted directly to subject position. It will be demonstrated that systematic promotion, that is Non-term to 3

FL 020 137

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics. Vol. 13, 1988. pp. 191-204.

to 2 to 1 advancement is not possible; and (4) that only in the case of locatives the movement of the whole location phrase is required, whereas, in the case of instrumentals only the NP of the instrumental phrase is promoted leaving the preposition behind attached to an obligatory resumptive pronoun.

The arguments advanced in this paper will lend support to previous analysis of the agglutinative languages (Dalgish 1976; Kamwangamalu 1985; and Kamwangamalu and Obeidat 1985). Before going into the analysis of the data, we will give a brief background of Shaba Swahili.

Swahili was not originally a Zairian language. It is a language transplanted from East Africa, and introduced into Zaire in the 18th and 19th centuries. It was first introduced in the Kivu province from where it spread both north into Haute Zaire and south into Shaba province. Its diffusion into Shaba was mainly due to the trading of ivory, copper, malachite, and slaves during those centuries. Today, it is a language spoken by over four million people in Shaba.

What is peculiar about Shaba Swahili was that it reflects a very complex linguistic situation. That is, its population consisted of people coming from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Among them were found the Sanga, Luba, Bemba, Tabwa, Chokwe, Lunda, Lamba, etc. The people spoke languages that were mutually unintelligible. Since they all had to interact among themselves and with traders, there was the need for a language of wider communication. Given the fact that Swahili was the language of the powerful people, namely the traders as well as the most influential local chief, Msiri, it was adopted as the lingua franca. During the colonization of the Belgians, Swahili was maintained as the lingua france in Shaba and was introduced as the language of education. The creation of the mining company in the Shaba province, which required all its workers to learn Swahili, contributed greatly to the expansion of this language.

Despite the rapid and wide spread of Swahili, ethnic languages were still used. That is, Swahili was the language of communication for people of linguistically and culturally different backgrounds whereas local languages were used only among people of the same community. Notwithstanding its role and influence in community, Swahili had to live side by side with local languages. This situation made if fit to undergo the linguistic rule of thumb whereby languages change in contact. Among the languages that influenced Swahili four have played a crucial role because of the number of their speakers in the Shaba community. The are: Luba, Bsemba, Sanga, and Shaba.

Shaba Swahili, like many Bantu languages is a SVO language. A typical sentence in this language requires a subject which is

the only element that controls agreement both on the modifiers as well as the verb of the sentence (for a discussion of word order in Swahili see Kamwangamalu and Obeidat 1985). Before examining the behavior of Non-terms in Shaba Swahili we will briefly discuss the behavior of Terms with respect to Passivization and Relativization.

Passivization

Sentences (1) and (2) show passivization of Terms in both transitive and intransitive (benefactive) clauses, respectively. The object Kitabu in (1)a becomes the superficial subject in (1)b and governs agreement on the verb as indicated by the prefix "ki." The logical subject "mutoto" becomes superficially the object and is put in Chomage.

1 a. Mutoto a- li-angusha kitabu.
Child Ag-TA-drop book
(The child dropped the book)

b. Kitabu ki-li-angush-w -a kuko mutota.
book Ag-TA-drop -pass-FV by child.
(The book was dropped by the child)

2 a. Mama a-li-pikia batoto chakula.
mother Ag-Ta-cook children food
(mother cooked food for the children)

b. Chakula ki-li-piki- wa batoto kuko mama.
food Ag-TA-cook-pass. children by mother
(The food was cooked for the children by mother)

c. Batoto ba-li-piki- wa chakula kuko mama.
children Ag-TA-cook-pass. food by mother
(The children were cooked food for by mother)

d. *Mama a-li-pikia chakula batoto.

In (2)a the benefactive verb "alipikia" has two objects: "batoto" (children) which is the IO, and "chakula" (food) which is the DO. The ordering in Shaba Swahili, like other Bantu languages is based on the notion of animacy. In (2)b the DO "chakula" is passivized and governs agreement on the verb. In (2)c the IO is passivized and promoted directly to the SU position where it governs agreement. One might argue that the IO has already been promoted to 2 which consequently means that 2 has been demoted to 3. Had this been the case, the DO "chakula" would have been put in Chomage in accordance with the Stratal Uniquiness Law and the Relational Annihilation Law. Thus, sentence (2)b would not be possible and the Term "chakula" would not be able to govern agreement on the verb. However, the data argue against that and indicate that passivization of IO is not a systematic promotion process, but rather that it is one step; i.e., IO to SU directly,

and systematic promotion, on the contrary, results in ungrammatical structure as in (2d).

Relativization

The process of relativization in Shaba Swahili is similar to passivization. The following examples are illustratives:

3 Kaka u-le a-li-nunua kabumbu a-li-kwenda ku masomo
brother Ag-Rm Ag-TA buy ball Ag-TA-go to school)
(The brother who bought the ball went to school)

4 Kitabu ki-le u-li-nunua ki-li-potea
book Ag-RM you-TA-buy Ag-TA-lose
(The book which you bought was lost)

5 Baimbwa ba-le mama a-li-patia chakula ba-li-kufa.
dogs Ag-Rm mother Ag-TA-give food Ag-Ta-die
(dogs which mother gave the food to died)

In (3) we have subject relativization and the relativized subject is "brother." In (4) we have DO relativization and the relativized NP is "kitabu" (book). In (5) the relativized NP is the IO "baimbwa" (dogs). Note that in each of these sentences the relativized NPs govern agreement not only on the verb in the matrix but in the embedded clause as well, as shown by the noun class prefixes on the verbs. Like passivization, IO relativization is a direct process also, that is 3 to 1 without systmatic promotion.

Passivization of Non-Terms

Now we will examine the behavior of Non-Terms, which is the main concern in this paper. We will start with passivization of locatives.

6 a. Mwalimu a-li-panda mauwa mu mashamba
teacher Ag-TA-plant flowers loc. garden
(The teacher planted flowers in the garden)

b. Mu mashamba mu-li-pand- wa mauwa kuko mwalimu.
loc. garden Ag-TA-plant-pas.flowers by teacher
(In the garden were planted flowers by teacher)

c. *mashamba mu-li-pand- wa mauwa mu(mo) kuko mwalimu
garden Ag-TA-plant-pas.flowers loc(RP) by teacher

d. *Mwalimu a-li-panda mu mashamba mauwa.

In (6)a the locative phrase "Mu mashamba" (in the garden) is promoted to the SU position in (6)b and governs agreement on the verb as indicated by the locative prefix "mu-". The logical

subject "mwalimu" became the object of the preposition "kuko" (by). Like Terms, locatives are passivized directly by promoting the whole locative phrase to the SU position. Any attempt to promote the locative to DO before passive, which is assumed by RG, will result in ungrammatical structures as in (6)d. Promoting the NP of the locative phrase, leaving the locative behind with or without a resumptive pronoun, will result in ungrammatical structures as (6)c.

7 a. Mama a-li-katia batoto nyama na kisu.
mother Ag-TA-cut children meat with knife
(mother cut the meat with the knife)

b. Kisu ki-li-kati-wa batoto nyama na-kio kuki mama
knife Ag-TA-cut-pass children meat with RP by mother
(with the knife was cut the meat
for the children by mother)

c. *Kisu ki-li-kati- wa batoto nyama na kuko mama.

d. *Na kisu ki-li-kati- wa batoto nyama kuko mama.

The instrumental "kisu" (knife) in (7)a is passivized and becomes the SU in (7)b, and it governs agreement on the verb "kilikatwa" as indicated by the prefix "ki-". However, unlike for locatives, Passivization of instrummentals is a direct advancement of the instrumental NP. When this happens, the prepositions "na-" (with) is left behind, and a resumptive pronoun referring to the instrumental NP has to be attached to the prepositions as can be seen in 7(b). The non-realization of a RP in the passivized site results in the ungrammatical sentence (7)cd. (7)d is ungrammatical because it involves a movement of the whole instrumental phrase "Na kisu".

Relativization of Non-Terms
Locatives

The data on Shaba Swahili demonstrates that locatives can not only freely relativize, but also undergo direct relativization. Moreover, whenever a locative relativizes into the subject position, it governs agreement on the verb.

8 a. Mama a-li-pikia batoto chakula mu pishi.
mother Ag-TA-cook children food loc.kitchen
(mother cooked food for the children in the kitchen).

b. Mu pishi mu-le mama a-li-pikia chakula mu-ko batoto
loc.kikchen Ag-RM mother Ag-TA-cook food Ag-be children
(In the kitchen where mother cooked food are children)

c. *Mama a-li-pikia batoto mu pishi chakula.

d. *Mu pishi mu-le mama a-li-pikia chakula ki-ku batoto.

The sentences in (8) are illustrative examples. The locative phrase "mu pishi" (in kitchen) has been relativized and promoted directly into the SU posision in (8)b. Note that it also governs agreement not only on the RM in the matrix clause, but also on the verb in the embedded clause "mu-ko" (be) from where it has been extracted. Any attempt to systematically promote the locative into DO position will result in ungrammatical structure as in (8)c. Sentence (8)b is ungrammatical because the agreement on the verb in the embeded clause "ki-ko" (be) is not governed by the locative NP, but rather by the preceding NP.

Instrumentals

The behavior of instrumentals in Shaba Swahili not different than that of terms and locatives. Instrumentals can undergo direct relativization and, like terms and locatives Instrumentals can undergo direct relativization and, like terms and locatives, they govern agreement on the verb.

9 a. Dada a-li-safisha manguo ya batoto na sabuni
sister Ag-TA-wash clothes of chilren with soap
(Sister washed the children clothes with soap)

b. Sabuni i-le dada a-li-safisha manguo ya batoto na -yo i-ko wapi?
soap Ag-RM sister Ag-TA wash clothes of childr. with-RP Ag-be Wh.?
(The soap with which sister washed the children's clothes is where?)

In (9)a, the instrumental NP "sabuni" (soap) has been relativized and promoted to SU position as it is shown in (9)b. Note that, similar to passivization, relativization of instrumentals moves only the instrumental NP and leaves the preposition behind with an obligatory RP in the relativized site from where it has been promoted. Like locatives, instrumentals also govern agreement on the relative marker in the higher clause as well as the verb "i-ko" (be) in the embedded clause as indicated by the presence of the prefix "i."

Interaction of Passive and Relativization Rules

In this section we will discuss the behavior of non-terms in complex structures, where more than one relation-changing rule is operative. We will demonstrate that non-terms which are inaccessible to relation-changing rules according the theory of RG can in fact undergo direct promotion to subject positions intersententially and still govern agreement.

10 a. Mu nyumba mu-le batoto be-ko ba-nacheza
loc. house Ag RM children Ag-be Ag-play
mu-lipik-wa Chakula kuko Juma
Ag cook-Pass food by Juma

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(In the house where the children were playing was cooked food by Juma)

b. Batoto be-ko ba-nacheza mu nyumba
children Ag be Ag-play loc. house
(the children are playing in the house)

c. Juma a-li-pikia chakula mu nyumba
Juma Ag-TA-cook food loc. house
(Juma cooked food in the house)

11 a. Kisu ki-le ki-li-kat-wa nyama na-kio kuko dada
knife Ag-RM Ag-TA-cut-pass meat with-RP by sister
ki-li-kat-wa ndizi na-kio kuko mutoto
Ag-TA-cut-Pass banana with-Ag by child
(the knife with which the meat was cut by sister was cut the banana with by the child)

b. Kisu ki-le dada a-li-kata nyama na-kio ki-li-kat-wa
knife Ag-RM sister Ag-TA-cut meat with-RP Ag-TA-cut-
ki-li-kat-wa ndizi na-kio kuko mutoto
Ag-TA-cut-Pass banana with-RP by child

(10)a comprises two clauses: (10)b and (10)c. In (10)a we have the locative NP "mu nyumba" (in house) promoted to subject position twice, first, in the embedded clause "mu nyumba muli-pikwa chakula kuko J", which is derived from (10)c. This is indicated by the locative prefix "mu-" on the verb "mu-li-pikwa" (to cook). Then the same locative NP has been promoted to the SU position in the matrix clause by a relativization rule and governs agreement on the relative marker as well.

In (11)a, we have the instrumental NP "kisu" (knife) promoted, also, to the SU position after it has been passivized in the embedded clause, then it undergoes another passive role where it becomes the SU of the matrix clause, leaving a RP attached to the preposition behind. Then the rule of relativization is applied. The instrumental NP in (11)a governs agreement in the sentence all the way through: on the RM "ki-le", the verb of the matrix clause "kilikatwa" and the verb of the embedded clause "kilikatwa".

In (11)b, the same instrumental "kisu" has been extracted from its position in the embedded instrumental phrase "na kisu" and promoted to the SU position in the same clause where it governs agreement on the verb "kilikatwa". Then the same instrumental NP is relativized into the SU position directly where it is shown to govern agreement on the RM "ki-le." After the application of the relativization rule in the matrix clause in (11)b, the instrumental cannot undergo passivization.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

To sum up the discussion, we have demonstrated that the behavior of non-terms is not restricted to relation-changing rules in simple structures, but also in the embedding to two clauses or more. We have shown that non-terms can be promoted directly into inaccessable positions more than once in complex structures with more than one syntactic rule involved and still govern agreement on verbs exactly like terms.

Instrumental Raising

In this section we argue against the language universal proposed in Postal (1977) implicit in most of the work on raising. We will also demonstrate that the modification proposed by Seiter (1978) cannot account for the facts present in Shaba Swahili as well as other agglutinative languages.

12 a. Ni-na-zani (kwamba) Juma a-na amini kwamba
I-TA-think (that) Juma Ag-TA-believe that
Mariamu a-li-kata salami na kisu
Mary Ag-TA-cut salami with knife
(I think that Juma believes that Mary cut
salami with a knife)

b. Kisu ki-le ni-na-zani (kwamba) Juma a-na-amini
knife Ag-RM-I-TA-think that Juma Ag-TA-believes
kwamba Mariamu a-li-kata salami na-kio ki-li-anguka
Mary Ag-TA-cut salami with-RP Ag-TA-fall
mu musalani
in sink
(the knife which I think that Juma believes
that Mary cut salami with fell in the sink)

c. Kisu ki-le ni-na zani kwamba Juma a-na-amini
knife Ag-RM I-TA-think that Juma Ag-TA-believes
kwamba Mariamu a-li-kata nyama na-kio ki-li-anguka
that Mary Ag-TA-cut meat with-RP Ag-TA-fall
mu musalani
in sink
(the knife that I think that Juma believes was
cut the meat with by Mary fell in the sink)

The instrumental NP "kisu" in (12)a has been promoted directly into SU position of the matrix clause in (12)b. Note that (12)b is an embedding of several clauses and the raised instrumental governs agreement on the RM of the matrix as well as the verb in the lowest embedded clause where it has been extracted from. Sentence (12)c shows that it is possible to raise the instrumental NP directly to the SU position in each clause applying relation-changing rules such as passivization. The instrumental NP has been promoted into the SU position in the second higher clause by the application of passive where it is shown to govern agreement on the verb "kilikatwa" (was cut). Then it has been raised again directly to the SU position in the matrix clause. Note the presence of the agreement suffix on the verbs in the clauses to which it has been promoted.

Now one might argue that raising the verbs like "believe" is a version of equi-NP deletion and does not present a real case of raising. To refute such a claim let us consider sentence (13) which involves the use of the verb "seem".

13 a. I- na-onekana sawa batoto ba-li-uwa
it-TA-seem that children Ag-TA-kill
kasha na kisu
antelope with knife
(It seems that the children killed
an antelope with a knife)

b. Kisu ki-na-onekana sawa batoto
knife Ag-TA-seem that children
ba-li-uwa kasha na-kio
Ag-TA-kill antelope with-RP
(with the knife it seems that
the children killed an antelope)

c. Kisu ki-na-onekana sawa ki-li-uwa
knife Ag-TA-seem that Ag-TA-kill
kasha na-kio kuko batoto
antelope with-RP by children
(with the knife it seems was killed
an antelope with by children)

d. Kisu ki-na-onekana sawa ba-li-uwa
kasha na-kio kuko batoto

e. Kisu ki-na-onekana sawa ba-li-uwa
kasha na-kio kuko batoto

f. *kisu a-na-onekana sawa ba-li-uwa kasha
nayo kuko batoto

The instrumental NP "kisu" in (13)a has been raised directly to the SU position, that is, oblique to 1, replacing the dummy (it) and governing agreement on the verb of the matrix clause. In (13)c, the instrumental NP is promoted directly by passivization to the SU position in the embedded clause, then raised to the SU position in the matrix clause. Note that agreement is governed on both verbs in the matrix as well as the embedded clause. (13)d and (13)e are the same sentences, but have different readings. (13)d is ungrammatical because of the wrong agreement on the verb "baliuwa" (to kill). The agreement on the verb is with "children" rather than" the knife", and hence ungrammatical. (13)e is grammatical if the prefix "ba" is not in agreement with "batoto" but rather refers to the impersonal passive "they" and "they" must not be coreferential with "batoto", in which case each of (13)d and (13)e will have different readings. Finally, (13)f is ungrammatical because its agreement is not governed by its subject, "kisu", rather it is governed by "kasha" which is the object.

Conclusions and Implications

We have demonstrated in this paper that in Shaba Swahili Non-Terms behave exactly like Terms. They can be promoted freely

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to the highest position on the hierarchy. Their promotion must not be systematic; that is, oblique to 3 to 2 to 1 advancement is possible. Non-Terms also, like Terms, govern agreement on verbs and undergo all types of relation-changing rules such as passivization, relativization, and raising. The problem of agreement, complex as it is in agglutinative languages, in not adequately accounted for in the theory of RG. (For a thorough discussion see Bokamba 1984).

The data analyzed in this paper argue against the Relational Succession Law which states that only Terms can bear grammatical relations to verbs and that no rule can ascend NPs out of constituents that are not SU, Do, or, (less likely) IO. The behavior of Non-Terms in Shaba Swahili also refutes the claim made by Perlmutter and Postal (1983:91) that there can be no advancement or demotion to oblique grammatical relations.

Since the distinction between Terms and Non-Terms is based on the grammatical relations that these elements bear to the verb, and their accessibliity to relation-changing rules, we claim that Non-Terms should be treated like Terms. Thus, universals proposed by the tenants of RG need to be revised to incorporate Non-Terms In the case of Passivization we can modify the Universal to include IOs and obliques as language particular phenomena, and the same for Relativization. In the case of Raising, also, we need to further modify the universal proposed by Seiter (1978) to incorporate obliques as well. Such modification will account for Non-Terms in Shaba Swahili and other languages. However it will not account for a language like Bahasa Malaysian (BM) which presents a very interesting but challenging question to RG. In BM, DO cannot undergo direct relativization. They have to first be promoted by a passive rule before they can relativize, whereas Non-Terms are, on the contrary, accessible to direct relativization (Chiang, 1979). Thus, should we also consider the behavior of some Terms as a language particular phenomenon? If we do, then we are refuting the whole theory of RG.

To avoid that, we propose that universals be stated in a way general "enough to capture all these languages" and their particular phenomena. We can simply say: Passivize any element, Relativize any element, and Raise any element. Rethinking such modifications, we are, in fact, merging into Chomsky's theory of MOVE ALPHA. Assuming this to be true, which in fact it is in Shaba Swahili and other languages such as Tshiluba and Lingala (Kamwangamalu & Obeidat, 1986), we can claim (1) that what is defined as Terms vs. Non-Terms is a language particular phenomenon, i.e., what is considered to be Non-Term in English, for example, is a Term in Shaba Swahili, and (2) consequently, systematic promotion is also a language particular phenomenon and not a language universal.

NOTES

1. We are very grateful to professor E. Bokamba for his helpful and valuable comments on this paper. However, all the weaknesses and mistakes are attributable to us. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 17th Annual Conference on African Linguistics at Indiana University: Bloomington in March 1986.

2. Shaba Swahili makes use of the demonstrative of non-proximity as a relative marker. That is, -le, which is the invariable stem of the relative marker together with the prefix (which is determined by the head noun) are used as the relative pronoun. If a demonstrative adjective is to be used, it will always precede the head noun whereas the relative pronoun always follows that head noun.

e.g.-Kaka u-le a-li-nunua kabumbu a-li-kwenda ku masomo
brother Ag-RM Ag-RM-buy ball Ag-Ta-go to school
(the brother who bought the ball went to school)
-U-le kaka u-le a-li-nunua kabumbu a-li-kwenda ku masomo
Ag-dem brother Ag-RM Ag-TA-buy ball Ag-TA-go to school
(That brother who bought the ball went to school)

2. The verb "kuuwa" (to kill) does not change in passive constructions; that is, Shaba Swahili has a rule that deleted the passive marker "-w-" because it is preceded by another "-w-".

e.g. ku-uwa ---→ kuuwwa -----→kuuwa
to kill ---------→ to be killed

4. In Shaba Swahili, as is the case in many Bantu languages, agreement is always governed by the subject of the sentence. Both Terms and Non-Terms can be used as subjects, and in this case they have to govern verb agreement. In this language, locatives and instrumentals are the only NonTerms that can be promoted into SU position; when this happens, they will control agreement on the verb.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Bokamba, E.G. 1975. Relativization in Bantu Languages revisited. Paper presented at the second Annual Conference of the Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States. The University of Toronto, Canada.

_____ 1984. Verbal Agreement as non-cyclic Rule in Bantu. In D.L. Goyvaerts, ed., African Linguistics: Essays in Memory of M.W.K. Semikenke, pp. 9-54. Amsterdam: John Bejamin Pub.

_____ and M. Drame. 1978 Where do Relative Clauses come from? CLS.

Chiang, Kee Yeoh. 1979. Interaction of Rules in Bahasa Malaysia. University of Illinois doctoral dissertation. Urbana, Illinois.

Dalgish, Gerald M. 1976a. Locative NPs; Locative suffixes and grammatical Relations. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society, pp. 139-148.

_____ 1976b. Passivizing Locatives in Olutsootsool Studies in the Linguistic sciences, 6:1.57-68.

Frantz, Donald G. 1981. Grammatical Relations in Universal Grammar. Monograph, The Summer Institute of Linguistics: University of Lethbridge.

Gary, J. and Keenan, 1977. on Collapsing Grammatical Relations in Universal Grammar. In Cole and Sadock, eds., Syntax and Semantics 8: Grammatical Relations. New York.

Johnston, D. 1974. Toward a Theory of Relational Based Grammar. PhD. dissertation, Univesity of Illinois, Urbana. Published by Garland and Publishing Co., Nuw York.

Kamwangamalu, 1985. Passivization in Bantu: Implications for Relational Grammar: In SLS 15.1

_____ and Obeidat H. 1985. Relativization in Bantu: A Relational Approach: In Papers from the 1985 Mid-America Conference KSU.

Kapanga, Mwamba 1985. Lubumashi Swahili Revisited. Paper presented at the 16th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, Yale University, Connecticut.

Keenan, E. 1976. Towards a Universal Definition of Subject. In Linguistics.

Comrie, B. 1977. Noun Phrase Accessability and Universal Grammar. Linguistic Inquiry 8:63-99

Kimenyi, A. 1976. A Relational Grammar of Kinuyarwanda. PhD Dissertation, UCLA

Obeidat, Hussein A. 1984. Relative Clauses in Standard Arabic Revisited. In SLA 14:2:77-97.

Perlmutter, D. 1972. Evidence for Shadow Pronouns in French Relativization. In The Chicago Which Hunt: Papers from the Relative Clause Festival. Peranteau, P.; Levi, J.; and Phares, G.; eds. Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago.

_____ ed/ and Postal, P. 1977. Lectures on Relational Grammar. Summer Linguistic Institute of the LSA. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

_____ 1980. Relational Grammar. Syntax and Semantics 13:Current Approaches to Syntax. Moravcsik and Wirth, eds.. Academic Press New York.

_____ 1983. Toward a Universal Characterization of Passivization. In Studies in Relational Grammar. Perlmutter, ed., University of Chicago Press.

Postal, P. 1977. Antipassive in French. Linguisticae Investigationes 1:333-74

Seiter, William 1983. Subject-Direct Object Raising. In Perlmutter, ed. (also in Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society. Whistler K. et al., eds Berkeley: University of California. 1978.)

ABBREVIATIONS

Ag = Agreement (Prefix)

TA = Tense/Aspect

RM = Relative Marker

Loc = Locative (Prefix)

Pass. = Passive (Suffix)

RP = Resumptive Pronoun